arXiv:cond-mat/0002184v1 [cond-mat.str-el] 13 Feb 2000

Magnetic impurities in the one-dimensional spin-orbital model

Yu-Wen Lee and Yu-Li Lee
Physics Department, National Tsing Hua University, Hsinchu, Taiwan

Using one-dimensional spin-orbital model as a typical example of quantum spin systems with richer symmetries, we study the effect of an isolated impurity on its low energy dynamics in the gapless phase through bosonization and renormalization group methods. In the case of internal impurities, depending on the symmetry, the boundary fixed points can be either an open chain with a residual spin or (and) orbital triplet left behind, or a periodic chain. However, these two fixed points are indistinguishable in the sense that in both cases, the *lead-correction-to-scaling boundary operators* (LCBO) only show Fermi-liquid like corrections to thermodynamical quantities. (Except the possible Curie-like contributions from the residual moments in the latter cases.) In the case of external (Kondo) impurities, the boundary fixed points, depending on the sign of orbital couplings, can be either an open chain with an isolated orbital doublet due to Kondo screening or it will flow to an intermediate fixed point with the same LCBO as that of the *two-channel* Kondo problem. Comparison with the Kondo effect in one-dimensional (1D) Heisenberg spin chain and multi-band Hubbard models is also made.

PACS numbers : 75.10Jm, 75.20Hr, 75.30Hx,

I. INTRODUCTION

In the past few years, there have been intensive studies on the one-dimensional spin-orbital model both analytically[1–3] and numerically[4–6]. Part of the reasons stems from the belief that the unusual magnetic properties observed in some recently discovered qusai-one-dimensional spin gapped materials such as $Na_2Ti_2Sb_2O$[7] and NaV_2O_5[8] can be explained by a simple two-band Hubbard model at quarter filling. Owing to the strong Coulomb repulsion, the corresponding low energy effective Hamiltonian can then be mapped onto a quantum spin model:

$$H = \sum_i J_1 \ \boldsymbol{S}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{S}_{i+1} + J_2 \ \boldsymbol{T}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{T}_{i+1} \\ + K \ (\boldsymbol{S}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{S}_{i+1})(\boldsymbol{T}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{T}_{i+1}) \ , \tag{1.1}$$

where $\boldsymbol{S}_i$ and $\boldsymbol{T}_i$ are spin one-half operators representing spin and orbital degrees of freedom at each site, respectively. For generic couplings $J_{1(2)}$ and K, the model (1.1) has a $\mathrm{SU}(2)_s \otimes \mathrm{SU}(2)_t$ symmetry. However, at the special couplings $J_1 = J_2 = K/4$, the symmetry group is enlarged to SU(4), which is Bethe ansatz integrable[9]. The low energy effective theory at this point is known to be described by the $\mathrm{SU}(4)_1$ Wess-Zumino-Novikov-Witten (WZNW) model, with central charge $c = 3$, equivalent to three decoupled free bosons[10].

Besides being as a quantum spin model for quasi-one-dimensional materials, the spin-orbital model can also appear as a low energy effective theory in other context. An example of this is the spin-tube model studied recently by E.Origanc et al.[11]. In that case, the spin and orbital operators do not represent the real spin or orbital degrees of freedom, but are just mathematical objects used to describe the degenerate ground states obtained after projecting out the high energy states in the Hilbert space via renormalization group transformation.

Earlier studies of the model (1.1) around the SU(4) point were concentrated on the Z_2 symmetric case $J_1 = J_2 = J$. The results show that when $J < K/4$ a small deviation from the SU(4) point is irrelevant[1], hence the low energy properties of the model is still controlled by the $\mathrm{SU}(4)_1$ fixed point mentioned above. In contrast, for $J > K/4$, the deviation results in marginally relevant interactions which open a gap in the spectrum, and the ground states are dimerized with alternating spin and orbital singlets. The low-lying excitations are just the fermions of the SO(6) Gross-Neveu model.

Recently, the region where $J_1 \neq J_2$ has been explored in Ref. 2,3, and it was shown that the gapless phase can be extended to a large region around the original gapless line. (region V in Ref. 2 or phase B in Ref. 3). Moreover, the low energy physics is described by $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{2,s} \otimes \mathrm{SU}(2)_{2,t}$ WZNW model, and the two level-two SU(2) WZNW models are in general characterized by different velocities u_s^*, u_t^*. These conclusions are also consistent with those obtained through numerical studies[6].

On the other hand, the Kondo effect or more generally speaking, the quantum impurity problem in one-dimensional strongly correlated electron systems is one of the central topics in condensed matter physics over the past few years. It is known that the interacting enviroment developed around each local scattering center changes its character drastically. For example, a weak potential scatterer renormalizes into an infinitely strong blockade to transport[12], while a one-channel Kondo impurity develops properties reminiscent of the two-channel Kondo effect[13]. From theoretical point of view, these problems usually provide interesting realizations of non-Fermi liquid physics, and the advances of nanofabrication techniques in the last few years make many of the above theoretical ideas can possibly be realized in laboratories.

In this paper, we would like to study the effect of local imperfection and Kondo problem of the one-dimensional spin-orbital model in its gapless phase. This can be viewd as a "stripped-down" version of quantum impurity problems where the charge degrees of freedom have been projected out, and may correspond to the Hubbard model at special filling, which becomes insulating due to Umklapp scattering. The effects of magnetic impurities on 1D Heisenberg chain have already been studied by S. Eggert et al.[14], and for the case of periodic chain, the *leading-correction-to-scaling boundary operator* (LCBO) is exactly the one that occurs in the two channel Kondo problem. For our case, the presence of orbital degrees of freedom make us expect nontrivial boundary critical behavior can occur through nontrivial LCBO. In fact, as we shall see, depending on the details, the system can flow to an open chain, a periodic chain or an intermediate boundary fixed point, and nontrivial scaling behavior can indeed occur. The content of this paper is organized as follows : In section II, we discuss bosonization formulas for bulk and open boundary conditions. Our results are presented in section III, and section IV is conclusions.

II. BOSONIZATION FOR BULK AND BOUNDARY OPERATORS

The model (1.1) around the SU(4) point ($J_1 \simeq J_2 \simeq K/4$) can be bosonized from the SU(4) Hubbard model at quarter filling[1] :

$$\begin{aligned} H = & \sum_i (-tc^\dagger_{i+1a\sigma} c_{ia\sigma} + H.c.) \\ & + \frac{U}{2} \sum_{iab\sigma\sigma'} n_{ia\sigma} n_{ib\sigma'} (1-\delta_{ab}\delta_{\sigma\sigma'}) \ , \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

by introducing the left and right movers for low energy degrees of freedom around the Fermi points ($k_F = \pi/4a_0$) :

$$\frac{c_{ia\sigma}}{\sqrt{a_o}} \simeq R_{a\sigma}(x)\ exp(ik_F x) + L_{a\sigma}(x)\ exp(-ik_F x) \ .$$

At this point, we can bosonize the above slowly varying fields as usual through introducing four chiral bosonic fields $\Phi_{a\sigma R/L}$ using the Abelian bosonization formula[15] :

$$\begin{aligned} R_{a\sigma} &= \frac{\kappa_{a\sigma}}{\sqrt{2\pi a_0}}\ exp(i\sqrt{4\pi}\Phi_{a\sigma R}) \ , \\ L_{a\sigma} &= \frac{\kappa_{a\sigma}}{\sqrt{2\pi a_0}}\ exp(-i\sqrt{4\pi}\Phi_{a\sigma L}) \ , \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

where the bosonic fields satisfy the commutation relation $[\Phi_{a\sigma R}, \Phi_{b\sigma' L}] = \frac{i}{4}\delta_{ab}\delta_{\sigma\sigma'}$, and the Klein factors $\kappa_{a\sigma}$ introduced here are used to insure the anticommutation relations between different flavors of fermions, which satisfies the following anticommutation rule $\{\kappa_{a\sigma}, \kappa_{b\sigma'}\} = 2\delta_{ab}\delta_{\sigma\sigma'}$. The physical properties of the system can be made more transparent by changing to a new basis :

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_c &= \frac{1}{2}(\Phi_{1\uparrow} + \Phi_{1\downarrow} + \Phi_{2\uparrow} + \Phi_{2\downarrow}) \ , \\ \Phi_s &= \frac{1}{2}(\Phi_{1\uparrow} - \Phi_{1\downarrow} + \Phi_{2\uparrow} - \Phi_{2\downarrow}) \ , \\ \Phi_f &= \frac{1}{2}(\Phi_{1\uparrow} + \Phi_{1\downarrow} - \Phi_{2\uparrow} - \Phi_{2\downarrow}) \ , \\ \Phi_{sf} &= \frac{1}{2}(\Phi_{1\uparrow} - \Phi_{1\downarrow} - \Phi_{2\uparrow} + \Phi_{2\downarrow}) \ . \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

Umklapp scatterings arising at higher order perturbation theory will result in a Mott transition at finite value of $U = U_c$, therefore for $U >> U_c$, the charge field Φ_c has a large gap, and only the spin-orbital part are left in the low energy sector. The remaining bosonized Hamiltonian can be further simplified by refermionization through the introduction of six Majorana fermions $\xi^a, a = 1 \dots 6$:

$$\begin{aligned} (\xi^1 + i\xi^2)_{R(L)} &= \frac{\eta_1}{\sqrt{\pi a_0}}\ exp(\pm i\sqrt{4\pi}\Phi_{sR(L)}) \ , \\ (\xi^3 + i\xi^4)_{R(L)} &= \frac{\eta_2}{\sqrt{\pi a_0}}\ exp(\pm i\sqrt{4\pi}\Phi_{fR(L)}) \ , \\ (\xi^5 + i\xi^6)_{R(L)} &= \frac{\eta_3}{\sqrt{\pi a_0}}\ exp(\pm i\sqrt{4\pi}\Phi_{sfR(L)}) \ , \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

where η_i are Klein factors. The resulting Hamiltonian can then be written as[3] :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H} = & -\frac{iu_s}{2}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{sR}\partial_x\boldsymbol{\xi}_{sR} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_{sL}\partial_x\boldsymbol{\xi}_{sL}) \\ & + (G_1 + G_3)(\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + \kappa_6)^2 \\ & - \frac{iu_t}{2}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{tR}\partial_x\boldsymbol{\xi}_{tR} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_{tL}\partial_x\boldsymbol{\xi}_{tL}) \\ & + (G_2 + G_3)(\kappa_3 + \kappa_4 + \kappa_5)^2 \\ & + 2G_3\ (\kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + \kappa_6)(\kappa_3 + \kappa_4 + \kappa_5) \ , \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

where the spin and orbital triplets are defined as : $\boldsymbol{\xi}_s = (\xi^2, \xi^1, \xi^6)$ and $\boldsymbol{\xi}_t = (\xi^4, \xi^3, \xi^5)$, κ_a is defined as $\xi^a_R\xi^a_L$. G_1 and G_2 measure the deviation from the SU(4) point, i.e. $J_1 = \frac{K}{4} + G_1$ and $J_2 = \frac{K}{4} + G_2$. $G_3 < 0$ is a nonuniversal parameter that could be extracted from the exact solution, and the two velocities u_s, u_t are in general not equal to each other.

It was shown in Ref. 2 and 3 that the Hamintonian (2.5) contains several phases. Especially, there exist an extensive region where the system is gapless and the the low energy fixed point is governed by a SU(2)$_{2,s}\otimes$SU(2)$_{2,t}$ WZNW model :

$$\mathcal{H} = \frac{1}{2\pi}\left\{\frac{u^*_s}{k_s+2} : \mathbf{J_s}\cdot\mathbf{J_s} : + \frac{u^*_t}{k_t+2} : \mathbf{J_t}\cdot\mathbf{J_t} :\right\} \ , \tag{2.6}$$

where $k_s = k_t = 2$, u^*_s and u^*_t are renormalized velocities of the fixed point theory for spin and orbital sectors, respectively. $J^a_{s,t}(x)$ ($a = 1, 2, 3$) are current operators for level two SU(2) WZNW model, whose Fourier modes obey the Kac-Moody algebra :

$$[J^a_n, J^b_m] = i\epsilon^{abc}J^c_{n+m} + \frac{1}{2}kn\delta_{n+m,0} \ .$$

The spin and orbital density operators have the following general forms:

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{S}_i \sim & \boldsymbol{J}_{sR} + \boldsymbol{J}_{sL} + \left(e^{i\pi x/2a_0}\boldsymbol{\mathcal{N}}_s + \text{H.c.}\right) \\ & + (-1)^{x/a_0}\boldsymbol{n}_s, \\ \boldsymbol{T}_i \sim & \boldsymbol{J}_{tR} + \boldsymbol{J}_{tL} + \left(e^{i\pi x/2a_0}\boldsymbol{\mathcal{N}}_t + \text{H.c.}\right) \\ & + (-1)^{x/a_0}\boldsymbol{n}_t, \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

here $\boldsymbol{J}_{s,t}$ are the smooth ($k \sim 0$) parts of the spin(orbital) density, while $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{N}}_{s,t}$ and $\boldsymbol{n}_{s,t}$ are the $2k_F = \pi/2a_0$ and $4k_F = \pi/a_0$ parts.

The current operators can be expressed in terms of Majorana fermions :

$$\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{J}_{sR(L)} &= -\frac{i}{2}\boldsymbol{\xi}_{sR(L)} \wedge \boldsymbol{\xi}_{sR(L)} \ , \\
\boldsymbol{J}_{tR(L)} &= -\frac{i}{2}\boldsymbol{\xi}_{tR(L)} \wedge \boldsymbol{\xi}_{tR(L)} \ .
\end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

The boson representations for $2k_F$ components $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{N}}_{s,t}$ are :

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{N}_s^z \propto\, & exp\ \{i\sqrt{\pi}(\Phi_s + \Phi_f + \Phi_{sf})\} \\
& - exp\ \{i\sqrt{\pi}(-\Phi_s + \Phi_f - \Phi_{sf})\} \\
& + exp\ \{i\sqrt{\pi}(\Phi_s - \Phi_f - \Phi_{sf})\} \\
& - exp\ \{i\sqrt{\pi}(-\Phi_s - \Phi_f + \Phi_{sf})\} \ , \\
\mathcal{N}_t^z \propto\, & exp\ \{i\sqrt{\pi}(\Phi_s + \Phi_f + \Phi_{sf})\} \\
& - exp\ \{i\sqrt{\pi}(\Phi_s - \Phi_f - \Phi_{sf})\} \\
& + exp\ \{i\sqrt{\pi}(-\Phi_s + \Phi_f - \Phi_{sf})\} \\
& - exp\ \{i\sqrt{\pi}(-\Phi_s - \Phi_f + \Phi_{sf})\} \ , \\
\mathcal{N}_s^+ \propto\, & exp\ \{i\sqrt{\pi}(\Theta_s + \Phi_f + \Theta_{sf})\} \\
& - exp\ \{i\sqrt{\pi}(\Theta_s - \Phi_f - \Theta_{sf})\} \ , \\
\mathcal{N}_t^+ \propto\, & exp\ \{i\sqrt{\pi}(\Phi_s + \Theta_f + \Theta_{sf})\} \\
& + exp\ \{i\sqrt{\pi}(-\Phi_s + \Theta_f - \Theta_{sf})\} \ ,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

where Θ_a are the dual fields of Φ_a, and satisfy $[\Phi_a(x), \Theta_b(y)] = i\delta_{ab}\Theta(y - x)$.

The $2k_F$ components can be written in a more compact way by noting that the six Majorana fermions could be associated with six critical Ising models. Then using the order and disorder operators, σ_a and μ_a, of the Ising models, they can be expressed as follows :

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{N}_s^z &\propto i\mu_1\mu_2\sigma_3\sigma_4\sigma_5\sigma_6 + \sigma_1\sigma_2\mu_3\mu_4\mu_5\mu_6 \ , \\
\mathcal{N}_t^z &\propto i\sigma_1\sigma_2\mu_3\mu_4\sigma_5\sigma_6 + \mu_1\mu_2\sigma_3\sigma_4\mu_5\mu_6 \ , \\
\mathcal{N}_s^+ &\propto (\sigma_1\mu_2 + i\mu_1\sigma_2)\,(\sigma_3\sigma_4\sigma_5\mu_6 + \mu_3\mu_4\mu_5\sigma_6) \ , \\
\mathcal{N}_t^+ &\propto (-\mu_3\sigma_4 + i\sigma_3\mu_4)\,(\mu_1\mu_2\sigma_5\mu_6 - \sigma_1\sigma_2\mu_5\sigma_6) \ .
\end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

The $4k_F$ part of spin and orbital operators, generated from higher harmonics of bosonization due to interactions, can be written down by noting that these operators should transform as vectors under $\mathrm{SO}(3)_{s,t}$ and carry no chirality[1] :

$$\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{n}_s &\propto i\boldsymbol{\xi}_{sR} \wedge \boldsymbol{\xi}_{sL} \ , \\
\boldsymbol{n}_t &\propto i\boldsymbol{\xi}_{tR} \wedge \boldsymbol{\xi}_{tL} \ .
\end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

Since the fixed point is governed by a $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{2,s} \otimes \mathrm{SU}(2)_{2,t}$ WZNW theory, it is better to write the above operators in a way which makes the symmetry properties more transparent. This can be done by noting that each components of $\boldsymbol{S}_i$ and $\boldsymbol{T}_i$ should transform as a vector under spin and orbital SU(2) rotations, respectively. This means that each components of $\boldsymbol{S}_i$ and $\boldsymbol{T}_i$ should be primary fields of the $\mathrm{SU}(2)_2$ WZNW model[16]. It can then be immediately seen that $\boldsymbol{J}_{s,t}$ are just the current operators of $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{2s,t}$ WZNW models, and the $2k_F$ components correspond to the spin 1/2 primary fields of it. The latter can be made evident from Eq. (2.10) by using the equivalence between a $\mathrm{SU}(2)_2$ WZNW theory and three critical Ising models[17]. Especially, the spin 1/2 primary field can be expressed as the product of three order or disorder operators of the corresponding three Ising models. We then have :

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{N}_s^a &\sim g_{sa}^{(2)} g_{t0}^{(2)} - i g_{sa}^{(1)} g_{to}^{(1)} \ , \\
\mathcal{N}_t^a &\sim g_{s0}^{(2)} g_{ta}^{(2)} - i g_{s0}^{(1)} g_{ta}^{(1)} \ ,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

where $a = 1, 2, 3$ and $g_{s,t\alpha}^{(1,2)}$ are defined as:

$$g = \tau^\alpha \Big(g_\alpha^{(1)} + i g_\alpha^{(2)} \Big) \ .$$

Here τ^α are Pauli matrices for $\alpha = 1, 2, 3$, τ^0 is the identity matrix, and $g_{s,t}$ are spin one-half primary fields of $\mathrm{SU}(2)_{2s,t}$ WZNW theory. The remaining primary fields with spin one $\Phi_{s,t}^{(1)}$ just correspond to the $4k_F$ components $\boldsymbol{n}_{s,t}$.

After completing discussions about the fixed point theory and its operator contents, we turn to the bosonized forms of the above operators in open boundary condition. The open chain boundary condition introduces the following boundary conditions on the left- and right- moving fermion fields[14] :

$$R_{a\sigma}(0) + L_{a\sigma}(0) = 0 \ ,$$

when transformed into boson language, it becomes

$$\Phi_{a\sigma R}(0) + \Phi_{a\sigma L}(0) = -\frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} \ .$$

We can then analytically continue the right-moving fields to left-moving fields by $\Phi_{a\sigma R}(x,t) = -\frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} - \Phi_{a\sigma L}(-x,t)$. In this way, we arrive at a description of the system in terms of *chiral* fields only.

With the above relations, we find for the boundary fields, we have :

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_{a\sigma}(x,t) &= -\frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} + \Phi_{a\sigma L}(x,t) - \Phi_{a\sigma L}(-x,t) \\
&\Rightarrow \Phi_{a\sigma}(0,t) = -\frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} \ , \\
\Theta_{a\sigma}(x,t) &= \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} + \Phi_{a\sigma L}(x,t) + \Phi_{a\sigma L}(-x,t) \\
&\Rightarrow \Theta_{a\sigma}(0,t) = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} + 2\Phi_{a\sigma L}(0,t) \ ,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

or in terms of Majorana fermions :

$$\xi_R^a(x,t) = \xi_L^a(-x,t) \ . \tag{2.14}$$

Substituting Eq. (2.13), Eq. (2.14) into Eq. (2.8), Eq. (2.9) and Eq. (2.11), it is easy to see that all components of spin (orbital) operators are propotional to the current operators, i.e. :

$$\boldsymbol{S}_{boundary} \propto \boldsymbol{J}_{sL}(0) \ , \quad \boldsymbol{T}_{boundary} \propto \boldsymbol{J}_{tL}(0) \ . \tag{2.15}$$

This completes our discussions about the bosonization formulas.

III. BOUNDARY CRITICAL BEHAVIOR

In this section, we shall apply the bosonization formulas obtained in previous sections to discuss the possible boundary fixed points. Two cases are considered here : local defects which result in a change of local coupling strength compared with the bulk value and an external local moment coupled to the bulk system (Kondo impurity).

A. Internal impurities

As discussed by Eggert and Affleck[14], in the case of local defect, there are two important symmetries which distinguish the possible boundary fixed points of a Heisenberg chain : The site parity P_S which is reflection of the chain about one site, and the link parity P_L which reflects the chain about one link. Another important symmetry of the lattice system is the translation by one site T, and we have the relation $P_L = P_S \otimes T$. As we shall see later, it is exactly the same symmetries which distinguish the possible boundary critical behaviors in the case of spin-orbital model.

We first discuss the case where the local defect is invariant under link parity P_L, i.e. altering the coupling strength of one link slightly. The corresponding operators are $\boldsymbol{S}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{S}_{i+1}$, $\boldsymbol{T}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{T}_{i+1}$, and $(\boldsymbol{S}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{S}_{i+1}) \times (\boldsymbol{T}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{T}_{i+1})$. Using Eq. (2.12) and the following fusion rules for SU(2)$_2$ WZNW model[21] :

$$\begin{aligned} &g\ \Phi \sim g\ , \\ &J_L^a(z)\ g(\omega,\overline{\omega}) \sim \frac{-\tau^a g}{z-\omega}\ , \\ &J_R^a(\overline{z})\ g(\omega,\overline{\omega}) \sim \frac{g\tau^a}{\overline{z}-\overline{\omega}}\ , \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

where g and $\boldsymbol{\Phi}$ are spin-1/2 and spin-1 primary fields, respectively. It is then easy to see that the leading contribution from $\boldsymbol{S}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{S}_{i+1}$ and $\boldsymbol{T}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{T}_{i+1}$ is :

$$\hat{O}_I = (i)^j (const.\ \mathrm{tr} g_s \cdot \mathrm{tr} g_t + const.\ \mathrm{tr} g_s^\dagger \cdot \mathrm{tr} g_t + \mathrm{H.c.})\ . \tag{3.2}$$

Since both g_s and g_t have conformal dimensions $(3/16, 3/16)$, the above operator $\hat{O}_I$ has scaling dimension $\Delta = \frac{3}{4}$ and is a relevant boundary operator. Hence a small deviation of the coupling will be drived to strong coupling for either sign of $\delta J_{1,2}$. The remaining operator $(\boldsymbol{S}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{S}_{i+1}) \times (\boldsymbol{T}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{T}_{i+1})$ can be extracted from fusion between two $\hat{O}_I$s and only contributes a marginal operator $\sim \mathrm{tr}\boldsymbol{\Phi}_s + \mathrm{tr}\boldsymbol{\Phi}_t$ which does not affect the RG flow. At this point, one important difference between the one-dimensional spin-orbital model and the usual antiferromagnetic Heisenberg chain should be noticed : For the spin-orbital model, the coupling constants between neighboring sites can be either antiferromagnetic (AF) or *ferromagnetic*[2,3,6] (FM). With this in mind, we expect the following possible strong coupling behaviors :

- Case I. $J_{1(2)} > 0$ and $\delta J_{1(2)} > 0$. The couplings will flow toward strong AF coupling, and the local spin (orbital) degrees of freedom will form a *singlet*. The system becomes an open chain with two fewer spin (orbital) degrees of freedom. The stability of this strong coupling fixed point is guaranteed by the fact that the LCBO at this fixed point is just the product of two boundary spin (orbital) chiral current operators which have dimension two, hence are irrelevant.

- Case II. $J_{1(2)} < 0$ and $\delta J_{1(2)} < 0$. The couplings will flow toward strong FM couplings, and the local spin (orbital) degrees of freedom will form a *triplet*. The system becomes an open chain with an additional triplet degree of freedom left. The stability of this strong coupling fixed point is guaranteed by the fact that the residual coupling between the triplet moment and the open chain is FM, hence is marginally irrelevant.

- Case III. $J_{1(2)} > 0$ and $\delta J_{1(2)} < 0$ or $J_{1(2)} < 0$ and $\delta J_{1(2)} > 0$. In this case, the coupling will flow to zero and leave a residual spin-orbital coupling $K(\boldsymbol{S}_0 \cdot \boldsymbol{S}_1)(\boldsymbol{T}_0 \cdot \boldsymbol{T}_1)$. The fate of these degrees of freedom at impurity sites 0 and 1 depends on the details of combinations of various possibilities. For example, if spin $\in$ case I, orbital $\in$ case III, the two sites will first form a spin singlet with a residual orbital degrees of freedom described by $\frac{-3}{4}K(\boldsymbol{T}_0 \cdot \boldsymbol{T}_1)$ which has a lower orbital triplet separated from a higher orbital singlet by a gap $\sim O(K)$. If in this case, $J_2 < 0$, then the strong coupling fixed point is just an open chain with an orbital triplet. If $J_2 > 0$, the triplet will be further screened by neighboring sites due to Kondo screening and the strong coupling fixed point is just an open chain. On the other hand, if spin $\in$ case II, orbital $\in$ case III, the two sites will form a spin triplet with a residual orbital degrees of freedom described by $\frac{1}{4}K(\boldsymbol{T}_0 \cdot \boldsymbol{T}_1)$ which has a ground state with an orbital singlet separated from the higher triplet state. Then with the same reasoning as previous discussion, one expect the strong coupling fixed point is either an open chain or an open chain with a spin triplet. In any case, they will still flow to either an open chain or an open chain with a residual ferromagnetic coupling to a spin or orbital triplet.

The resulting possible boundary critical behavior is summarized in table I. Besides, we should mention that the appearance of a local triplet will not change the LCBOs, and only leads to an additional ground state degeneracy, hence an additional impurity entropy $S_{imp} = \ln 3$. Of course these asymptotically decoupled local moments will also add a Curie-like contribution to $\mathcal{C}_{imp}$ and χ_{imp}, in additional to logarithmic corrections characteristic of asymptotic freedom.

We now turn to the case where the local defect respects site parity P_s, i.e. varying the coupling strength of two adjacent links by the same amounts. In this case, the leading boundary operator arises from the sum of $\boldsymbol{S}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{S}_{i+1}$ and $\boldsymbol{T}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{T}_{i+1}$ between two adjacent links. Due to the staggering factor in front of the $2k_F$ and $4k_F$ components, in the continuum limit, it is just the differential of Eq. (3.2) :

$$\frac{d}{dx}\left(const.\ \mathrm{tr}g_s \cdot \mathrm{tr}g_t + const.\ \mathrm{tr}g_s^\dagger \cdot \mathrm{tr}g_t + \mathrm{H.c.}\right) \ , \quad (3.3)$$

which has scaling dimension $1 + \frac{3}{4} = \frac{7}{4}$. Therefore, we conclude that a small deviation of coupling strength of two adjacent sites is irrelevant and the low energy fixed point is just a periodic chain. Since the open chain with a decoupled spin or orbital doublet is stable only for ferromagnetic couplings, we arrive at the conclusion that when $J_{1,2} > 0$, the open chain will be unstable and flow to the stable periodic chain with the impurity site included. However, for $J_{1,2} < 0$, the open chain and periodic chain fixed points are not connected by a monotonous RG flow.

From the above discussions, we find that for a local defect, there can be two possible boundary critial behaviors similar to that of a Heisenberg chain[14] :

- For impurities which violate the site parity P_s , the infrared fixed point corresponds to an open boundary condition.
- For impurities which respect P_s (hence violate P_L), the local defect is irrelevant if the deviation of coupling strength is not too large and at low energy, the chain "heals".

TABLE I. Possible boundary critical behaviors for a local defect respect link parity P_L (OC represents the open chain, T_s and T_t represent residual spin and orbital triplets, respectively) :

	$J_1 > 0$ $J_2 > 0$	$J_1 > 0$ $J_2 < 0$	$J_1 < 0$ $J_2 > 0$	$J_1 < 0$ $J_2 < 0$
OC	√	√	√	√
OC+T_s	√		√	√
OC+T_t	√	√		√
OC+$T_s + T_t$				√

B. External impurities

In this section, we discuss the boundary critical behavior for an external spin 1/2 local moment coupled to the bulk system via AF exchange (Kondo) coupling. The Hamiltonian is decomposed as $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_0 + \mathcal{H}_K$ where $\mathcal{H}_0$ is Eq. (2.6) and $\mathcal{H}_K$ is :

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}_K &= J_K \boldsymbol{S}_{imp} \cdot \boldsymbol{S}_0 \ , \\ &= \boldsymbol{S}_{imp} \cdot \Big\{ \lambda_F \boldsymbol{J}_s(0) + \lambda_B (\boldsymbol{N}_s(0) + \boldsymbol{N}_s^\dagger(0)) \\ &\quad + \lambda_{4k_F} \boldsymbol{n}_s(0) \Big\} \ . \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

Here $J_K > 0$ is the Kondo coupling. $\lambda_F, \lambda_B, \lambda_{4k_F}$ are the forward, backward , $4k_F$ scattering strength, respectively, and all are proportional to J_K. Since the Kondo coupling is antiferromagnetic, all the above coupling constants are relevant. In fact, they satisfy the renormalization group equations :

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d\lambda_F}{d\ln L} &= \frac{1}{2\pi u_s^*}(\lambda_F^2 + \lambda_{4k_F}^2) \ , \\ \frac{d\lambda_B}{d\ln L} &= \frac{1}{4}\lambda_B + \mathcal{O}(\frac{\lambda_B \lambda_F}{\pi u_s^*}) \ , \\ \frac{d\lambda_{4k_F}}{d\ln L} &= \frac{1}{\pi u_s^*}\lambda_F \cdot \lambda_{4k_F} \ . \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

Note that the most crucial difference between forward scattering and other couplings is that the latter breaks chiral symmetry and they couple orbital degrees of freedom to the impurity spin. Also note that backward scattering is the most relevant one which will flow to strong coupling for both ferro- and antiferromagnetic couplings. For the conveniences of latter boundary conformal field analysis, we should first transform this problem into a chiral form : Both the spin and orbital sectors of Hamiltonian (2.6) can be mapped to a chiral theory by first folding the system to the positive $x-$axis through defining $\boldsymbol{J}^1_{L/R}(x) \equiv \boldsymbol{J}_{L/R}(x)$, $\boldsymbol{J}^2_{L/R}(x) \equiv \boldsymbol{J}_{R/L}(-x)$. Interpreting the time axis as a boundary where $\boldsymbol{J}^1_{L/R}(\tau, 0) = \boldsymbol{J}^2_{R/L}(\tau, 0)$, we can then analytically continue the theory back to the whole $x-$axis and it is described by two chiral (left-handed) currents. Furthermore, since backward scattering breaks the SU(2)⊗SU(2) symmetry down to its diagonal one, it is better to write the Hamiltonian in a way which makes the symmetry more transparent. For this purpose, we use the following *coset* construction[21] :

$$SU(2)_2 \otimes SU(2)_2 \sim SU(2)_4 \otimes \mathcal{G} \ , \quad (3.6)$$

where $\mathcal{G}$ is the $N = 1$ SUSY unitary minimal model with $c = 1$. By matching the scaling dimensions and spin properties, we can establish the relations between the product of conformal towers in these two representations. For our present purpose, we only need the following :

$$\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)_2 \times \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)_2 = (0)_4 \times \left[\phi_{(2,1)}\right] + (\mathbf{1})_4 \times \left[\phi_{(2,3)}\right] \ , \quad (3.7)$$

where $[\phi_{(p,q)}]$ are conformal towers of $\mathcal{G}$. The corresponding primary fields have conformal dimensions $h_{p,q} = \frac{(3p-2q)^2-1}{48} + \frac{1}{32}[1 - (-1)^{p-q}]$. $(j)_k$ is the conformal tower of SU(2)$_k$ WZNW theory with spin j . With this new representation, the spin (orbital) current operator $\boldsymbol{J}_s(0) = \boldsymbol{J}_{sL}(0) + \boldsymbol{J}_{sR}(0) = \boldsymbol{J}^1(0) + \boldsymbol{J}^2(0) \equiv \mathbf{J}(0)$ is now the current operator of chiral SU(2)$_4$ WZNW model, and the Kondo interaction can be rewritten as[22] :

$$\mathcal{H}_K = \left[\lambda_F \mathbf{J}(0) + \tilde{\lambda}_B \mathbf{\Phi}(0) \phi^s_{(2,3)} \phi^t_{(2,1)}\right] \cdot \mathbf{S}_{imp} \ , \quad (3.8)$$

where $\tilde{\lambda}_B$ is propotional to λ_B, and $\mathbf{\Phi}$ is the spin one primary field of SU(2)$_4$ WZNW theory. It can then be immediately seen that if both λ_B and λ_{4k_F} vanish, this problem can be solved as the usual Kondo problems[18,20] : The impurity spin can be absorbed at special value of coupling $\lambda_F^* = 2u_s^*/(2+k)|_{k=4}$ by redefining the spin current as the sum of that of electrons and impurity, $\mathbf{J}(x) + 2\pi \mathbf{S}_{imp}\delta(x) \to \mathbf{J}(x)$. The boundary fixed point in this case is known to be that of the *four-channel* Kondo problem whose LCBO is the Kac-Moody descendant of the spin one primary field $\mathbf{J}_{-1} \cdot \mathbf{\Phi}^{(1)}$ which leads to non-Fermi-liquid corrections to thermodynamical quantities. However, as we shall argue in the following, backward scattering will destabilize the four-channel Kondo intermediate fixed point. The system will be drived to the strong coupling open chain fixed point or a new intermediate fixed point depending on whether the coupling strength of orbital sector J_2 is ferro- or antiferromagnetic.

In fact, from eq. (3.5), we expect that λ_B will scale to infinity first and dominate the low energy physics. To get a physical picture, we can do strong coupling analysis of the original lattice model : At strong coupling, the impurity spin forms a singlet with the spin at site zero and leaves an orbital doublet behaind. For the case where $J_2 < 0$, the stability of this fixed point is guaranteed. We therefore conclude that in this case, the boundary fixed point is just an open chain. In other word, *no* LCBOs can come from the s=1 conformal tower of the spin sector. The leading operators are then the usual dimension two operators $\mathbf{J}^2$ which originate from exchange interaction between edge spins and orbitals. However, in the case where $J_2 > 0$, the strong coupling fixed point is unstable and the system will flow to some unknown intermediate fixed point. To determine the fate of the RG flow, we consider a special point in our parameter space with $J_2 > 0$, i.e. the SU(4) point where the underlying microscopic Hamiltonian can be considered as the SU(4) Hubbard model. Away from quarter filling, the Hilbert space can be decomposed into three parts : charge-, spin- and flavor conformal towers, and since the Kondo interaction breaks chiral invariance, operators with nonzero charge, spin and flavor quantum numbers can occur as long as they transform as singlets under the corresponding daigonal subgroups. The possible impurity critical behavior can be determined by identifying LCBOs which satisfy the following two conditions[18,19] : (i) *produce a noninteracting limit consistent with known results*, and (ii) *respect the symmetries of the Hamiltonian.* By transforming to a basis with definite parity, it is easy to see that only channels with positive parity coupled to the impurity spin, hence the noninteracting limit of SU(4) Hubbard model corresponds to two-channel Kondo fixed point. Using this as a reference point, we can borrow the results of Ref. 19 : The two leading boundary operators are $e^{i\sqrt{\pi}/4K_\rho\phi_c} \times \phi_s \times \phi_f$ and $\mathbf{J}^1_{-1} \cdot \mathbf{\Phi}^1 + \mathbf{J}^2_{-1} \cdot \mathbf{\Phi}^2$, where K_ρ is the Luttinger liquid paremeter and ϕ_c is the charge field. $\phi_{s,f}$ are singlet fields under the diagonal SU(2) subgroup and they are equal to $\phi^{s,t}_{(2,1)}$ in terms of our previous coset language. Upon approaching quartering, Umklapp scattering opens a charge gap for ϕ_c and the remaining part of the first boundary operator has dimension smaller than one, therefore should be surpressed by selection rules. Only the second interaction independent boundary operator survives in our case. Since we do not expect any qualitative change when the parameters deviate from the SU(4) point slightly as long as we are still in the same phase, together with the above renormalization group analysis we conclude that the system flows to a two channel Kondo fixed point for antiferromagnetic orbital couplings.

C. Thermodynamical behavior

In this section, we briefly discuss the corrections of specific heat and magnetic susceptibility induced by LCBOs, i.e. the corrections of LCBO $\lambda_I \mathcal{O}(0)$ to the fixed point theory $\mathcal{H}^*$. The first type of LCBOs corresponding to open chain fixed point are the Virasoro decendants of identitiy operators : $\mathbf{J}_1^2$, $\mathbf{J}_2^2$, and $\mathbf{J}_1 \cdot \mathbf{J}_2$. These operators will contribute to impurity free energy defined by $\delta f_{imp}(T, \lambda_I) = f_{imp}(T, \lambda_I) - f_{imp}(T, 0)$ in the *first order* of λ_I. Since these operators have dimension two, we expect that λ_I is proportional to $1/T_K$, where T_K is the temperature scale at which the coupling strength of the relevant perturbations becomes of order one. Because the relevant operators are of dimension 3/4, we have $T_K \propto \delta J^4/v$ for a small amount of initial change of coupling strength δJ . Then from dimensional consideration, we expect the correction to the specific heat $\mathcal{C}_{imp}$ should be proportional to T/T_K, and for the same reason, the correction to the magnetic susceptibility χ_{imp} should be proportional to $1/T_K$, i.e. at $T \to 0$, it produces a T independent behavior. Note that this result is identical to that of the Heisenberg chain except the "Kondo temperature" T_K has a different scaling relation with the coupling strength.

The second type of LCBO corresponding to periodic chain boundary condition is Eq. (3.3) which as we shall see, is a Virasoro primary operator. Consequently, its finite-temperature expection value vanishes, and its contribution to f_{imp} only starts from the *second order* of λ_I. In order to proceed the caculations, it is better to transform into a chiral representation as previous subsection. To do this, we first note that Eq. (3.3) can be written as $\mathbf{J}_{-1,s} \cdot \mathrm{tr} g_s \boldsymbol{\sigma} \mathrm{tr} g_t + \mathrm{tr} g_s \mathbf{J}_{-1,t} \cdot \mathrm{tr} g_t \boldsymbol{\sigma}$, where $\mathbf{J}_{-1} = \mathbf{J}_{R,-1} + \mathbf{J}_{L,-1}$ and is equal to $\mathbf{J}_{1,-1} + \mathbf{J}_{2,-1}$ in terms of chiral fields. At this point, we can use the coset relation (3.6) to cast the above operator into a simpler form. In fact, noting that $\mathrm{tr} g\boldsymbol{\sigma} \to g_1^\alpha \boldsymbol{\sigma}_\alpha^\beta g_{2\beta} \to \mathbf{\Phi}\phi_{(2,3)}$ and $\mathrm{tr} g \to g_1^\alpha g_{2\alpha} \to \phi_{(2,1)}$, the leading irrelevant operator becomes $\mathbf{J}_{s,-1} \cdot \mathbf{\Phi}_s \phi^s_{(2,3)} \phi^t_{(2,1)} + (s \leftrightarrow t)$. Following methods in Ref. 20, it can be shown that second-order perturbation theory results in an impurity specific heat :

$$\mathcal{C}_{imp} = \lambda_I^2 A \left(\frac{1}{u_s^{*2\Delta-3/4} u_t^{*3/4}} + \frac{1}{u_t^{*2\Delta-3/4} u_s^{*3/4}} \right) \times \frac{2\Delta}{3(2\Delta-3)} \pi^2 \tau_0^{3-2\Delta} T \ ,$$

where $\Delta = \frac{7}{4}$ is the dimension of $\frac{d}{dx}\hat{O}_I$, τ_0 is an infrared cutoff, and $A = 3(2 + \frac{k}{2}) = 12$. Similarly, the impurity magnetic susceptibility can be obtained :

$$\chi_{imp} = \frac{\lambda_I^2 A'}{u_s^{*2\Delta-3/4} u_t^{*3/4}} \tau_0^{3-2\Delta} + O(\sqrt{T}),$$

where $A' = 2(2+\frac{k}{2})^2 = 32$. Note that although this LCBO looks nontrival, it only produces Fermi-liquid like behaviors because its dimension is "too high".

The third type of LCBO is the Kac-Moody descendent of spin one primary field from the spin and orbital sector : $\mathbf{J}^1_{-1}\cdot\mathbf{\Phi}^1 + \mathbf{J}^2_{-1}\cdot\mathbf{\Phi}^2$ which appears in the case of Kondo impurity with antiferromagnetic orbital couplings and is equal to $\mathbf{J}_{-1}\cdot\Phi\phi_{(3,3)}$ in terms of coset representation, where $\mathbf{J}$ and Φ are now elements of $k=4$ WZNW theory . It is exactly the same leading irrelevent operator as the *two-channel* Kondo problem except now it involves both spin and orbital sectors. It produces the following well-known form of impurity specific heat and magnetic susceptibility[20] :

$$\mathcal{C}_{imp} \sim \lambda_I^2 T \ln(T_k/T)\ ,\ \chi_{imp} \sim \lambda_I^2 \ln(T_k/T)\,.$$

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSIONS

To summarize, we have studied possible boundary critical behaviors for the one-dimensional spin-orbital model in its gapless phase with a magnetic impurity. For the case of internal impurities, there can be either an open chain or periodic chain fixed point. The underlying reason for the occurrence of these two different critical behaviors is similar to that of the Heisenberg spin chain : The leading instability for periodic chain is determined by the spin and orbital dimerization operators $\epsilon_s(x) = i^j(\boldsymbol{S}_j\cdot\boldsymbol{S}_{j+1})$ and $\epsilon_t(x) = i^j(\boldsymbol{T}_j\cdot\boldsymbol{T}_{j+1})$. Although they are allowed for impurities which violate the site parity P_s, they are prohibited for impurities respecting P_s, with $\partial_x\epsilon_{s,t}(0)$ being the leading irrelevant operators. The new feature in this case is that due to the existance of additional orbital degrees of freedom and that the couplings between sites can be ferromagnetic, there can be spin or (and) orbital triplet at the impurity site together with the open chain at the low energy fixed point.

For the case of Kondo impurity, we see that it can either flow to an open chain fixed point or an intermediate fixed point depending on the sign of orbital couplings. This should be compared with the case of Kondo effect in Luttinger liquid or Hubbard model at incommensurate filling. In that case, the backward scattering which breaks chiral symmetry will result in nontrivial leading irrelevant operators from the charge sector with $\mathrm{Q}_R - \mathrm{Q}_L \neq 0$. The operators arising from coset construction obtained via diagonal embedding $(\mathrm{SU}(2)_R\otimes\mathrm{SU}(2)_L/\mathrm{SU}(2)_{diag})$ can also appear together with the ones from the charge sector through nontrivial *selection rules*. In fact, these leading irrelevant operators correspond to electron hopping with spin (orbital) flip between two ends in the open chain fixed point. In the present case, since the charge field is gapped, these processes cannot occur and only exchange interaction between edge spins (orbitals) can appear as LCBOs. A new feature in this case is that when orbital coupling is AF, the strong coupling fixed point will be destabilized and thermodynamical quantities at the intermediate fixed point show interesting temperature dependence similar to that of the two-channel Kondo effect.

Finally, since our theory is characterized by two different velocities, and in the case of periodic chain boundary fixed point, the contribution to $\mathcal{C}_{imp}$ and χ_{imp} from the LCBO is the same as that of the dimension two Virasoro descendents $\mathbf{J}^2$, a universal Wilson ratio can not be defined generally.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by National Science Council of R.O.C. under the Grant No. NSC89-2811-M-007-0015.

---

[1] P. Azaria, A. O. Gogolin, P. Lecheminant, and A. A. Nersesyan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 624 (1999).

[2] C. Itoi, S. Qin, and I. Affleck, cond-mat/9910109.

[3] P. Azaria, E. Boulat and P. Lecheminant , cond-mat/9910218.

[4] Y. Yamashita, N. Shibata, K. Udea, Phys. Rev. B **58**, 9114 (1998).

[5] B. Frischmuth, F. Mila, M. Troyer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 835 (1999).

[6] Y. Yamashita, N. Shibata, K. Udea, cond-mat/9908237.

[7] E. Axtell et al., J. Solid State Chem. **134**, 423 (1997).

[8] M. Isobe and Y. Udea, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **66**, 326 (1997).

[9] B. Sutherland, Phys. Rev. B **12**, 3795 (1975).

[10] I. Affleck, Nucl. Phys. **B 265**, 409 (1986) and I. Affleck, Nucl. Phys. **B 305**, 582 (1988).

[11] E. Origanc, R. Citro, and N. Andrei, cond-mat/9912200.

[12] C. L. Kane and M. P. A. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B **37**, 3769 (1992).

[13] A. Furusaki and N. Nagaosa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 892 (1994).

[14] S. Eggert and I. Affleck, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 10866 (1992).

[15] For a gereral review of Abelian and Non-Abelian bosonization, see for example, I. Affleck, *Fields, Strings and Critical Phenomena*, edited by E. Brezin and J. Zinn-Justin (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1990).

[16] The only exception is the current operators which are of course not primary operators. However, the SU(2) generator is $\int J^a(x) \sim J^a_0$, and we have $[J^a_0, J^a_n] = i\epsilon^{abc}J^c_n$.

[17] A. B. Zamolodchikov and V. A. Fateev, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **43** , 657 (1986).

[18] P. Fröjdh and H. Johannesson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 300; Phys. Rev. B **53**, 3211 (1996).

[19] M. Granath and H. Johannesson, Phys Rev B **57**, 987 (1998). Note that although the symmetry group of our bulk theory is SU(4) which is different from that considered in this paper, upon coupled to magnetic moment, the symmetry already breaks down to $\mathrm{U}(1)\times\mathrm{SU}(2)_s\times\mathrm{SU}(2)_f$, and the only difference is the relationship between the Coulomb

interaction strength U and the Luttinger liquid parameter K_ρ, which does not affect the following analysis.

[20] I. Affleck and A. W. W. Ludwuig, Nucl. Phys. **B 360**, 641 (1991).

[21] For a review of conformal field theory, see for example, P. Ginsparg in *Fields, Strings and Critical Phenomena*, edited by E. Brezin and J. Zinn-Justin (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1990). See also S. V. Ketov, *Conformal Field Theory* (World Scientific, 1995).

[22] Here we neglect the $4k_F$ part because its symmetry properties are similar to thoses of the backward scattering part and it has higher dimensions. This does not affect our conclusions.